DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 008 UD 009 318

AUTHOR	Carton, Aaron S.
TITLE	Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Regular Day Schools. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.
Spons Agency	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pub Date	Oct 67
Note	78p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.00
Descriptors	Attendance, Corrective Reading, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Elementary School Students, *Junior High School Students, Parochial Schools, *Private Schools, Remedial Reading Programs, Retarded Readers, Student Attitudes
Identifiers	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City

Abstract

The main objective of the New York City Corrective Reading Project, funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title 1, was the improvement of reading competence in students with reading retardation of one year or more in grades 1-4, or with retardations of two years or more in grades 5-8. The program was implemented in 171 non-public regular day schools whose student bodies were derived from low-income families. Corrective reading teachers, responsible to and employed by the New York City Board of Education, visited the schools on a part-time basis. This group of teachers was specially trained and these teachers are evaluated along with the evidence of improved reading performance, attendance and attitude toward school. Interview and questionnaire forms used in the program are appended. (KG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVI
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATI

09313 E

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

ED034008

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS

Aaron S. Carton

UD 009 318

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

October 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	1
NATURE OF THE EVALUATION STUDY	3
FINDINGS	7
Extent of Implementation	7
School Factors Influencing the Functioning of the Instructional Program	12
Reactions to the Corrective Reading Program	15
The Selection of Pupils for the Program	17
Nature of the Pupil Population	22
Corrective Reading Teachers	29
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	38
APPENDIX A: Tables	A1
APPENDIX B: Instruments	B1
APPENDIX C: Staff List	C1

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The main objective of the Corrective Reading Program was the improvement of reading competence in a group of children suffering from reading retardations of one year or more in the first four elementary grades or retardations of two years or more in grades five through eight. The stated objectives of the program included:

1. Improved performance as measured by standardized achievement tests;
2. Improved classroom performance in reading;
3. Improved children's average daily attendance;
4. Improved attitude toward school and education.

The procedures developed by the Board of Education to implement the program consisted of: (a) training a corps of teachers to provide these services; (b) furnishing corrective reading instruction by these specialized teachers to small groups; (c) supplying curricular materials and equipment to facilitate instruction.

The program was staged in a group of nonpublic regular day schools[1] that served attendance areas with high concentrations of low-income families. The number of schools was 171. These denominational schools in New York City received the services of corrective reading teachers employed by and responsible to the New York City Board of Education. These teachers visited the participating

---

[1] Nonpublic regular day schools includes both secular and parochial private schools. Only parochial schools participated in this program.

schools on a part-time basis and for the most part, worked in two different schools throughout the school year. Most schools received the services of one or another corrective reading teacher every day of the week.

A coordinator was appointed by the Board of Education to administer the program and supervise the teachers. Liaison personnel, chosen by the Board and denomination officials, were available to facilitate communication between public and nonpublic school administrators. According to sources at the Board of Education, the program resembled (in its essentials) the Corrective Reading Program of the New York City Public Schools.

CHAPTER II

NATURE OF THE EVALUATION STUDY

Objectives of the Evaluation - The study was directed at three major objectives. These were:

1. A determination of the degree to which the program outlined in the original proposal had been realized, including a study of the children selected for corrective reading services;
2. An assessment of the effect of the program on the pupils it served.
3. It was necessary to train a corps of corrective reading teachers for the program. This aspect assumed special consideration in the evaluation.

The main emphasis of the proposal was in supplying a service and in determining whether or not the service was effective. Given this direction, the present evaluation did not concentrate on the identification of general principles that might contribute to the effectiveness of educational operations, nor with the development of alternate procedures that might involve different costs and different levels of effectiveness.

Strategy and Procedures - Plans for developing a formal, experimental design were rejected for a variety of reasons, the most important being that the conventional (and to date, optimal) comparison-of-groups design could not be developed. The identification

of an appropriate control group in the participating schools proved unfeasible. A sample of "acceptable equivalent" pupils in the program schools was not available because the program was designed to reach all the children defined as its target population. The proposal included plans for replacing children whose reading deficiencies had been remedied with other eligible children from a waiting list. In other words, cases that might have been identified as a "control group" could, at any time, have entered into the "experimental group."

Since it proved impossible to identify an equivalent group of pupils in the same schools to control for the effects of the program, an effort was made to obtain a control group in the public schools' Corrective Reading Program; a comparison between such groups might have shed light on the nonpublic aspects of the Title I program. Initial review of the data that had been collected however, revealed too many divergent variables requiring control and too many unknown factors in testing procedures to permit scientifically acceptable interpretation. Therefore, in the present evaluation, where the evaluator did not participate in the formulation of the program or the initial study design, a policy was formulated of gathering data from nonpublic schools by interview, observation, and questionnaire. As many available test scores, records, and documents as possible were examined. Attempts were made to resolve questions of the validity of various measure-

ments by cross-checking against several alternative sources of information. Finally, there were some questions of the appropriateness of using the available tests and measures that became apparent only in the final analysis of the data, and which will be discussed in later sections.

Procedures - Three categories of procedures were used in this evaluation. First there were direct observations of the instructional process in the classroom. A sample of 20 schools was visited by members of the evaluation staff, who made systematic observations of the instructional process and who interviewed principals,[1] classroom teachers, corrective reading teachers, and participating pupils. This sample of 20 schools was chosen to proportionally represent the various denominational schools participating in the program. Consideration was given to selecting sample schools that did not participate in the intensive evaluation of the Corrective Mathematics Program.

The techniques for observation and interview, and the formulation of a standard form for the preparation of protocols were developed in a short training program (see Appendix B). The entire evaluation staff, consisting of the chairman and three associates, all experienced in teaching and in systematic observation, visited

---

[1] In some nonpublic schools principals delegated liaison responsibility for the Corrective Reading Program to key administrative personnel in the school. In this report, these administrators will be treated together with principals.

one school together. This visit was followed by a series of meetings in which the aspects of the program to be observed were selected, the observation and interview techniques of each observer were analyzed and refined, and the actual forms for data collection were developed. The evaluation chairman, together with different members of his staff, observed several schools, both in order to collect data, and to insure a standard level of uniformity in the approach to each school. Also included in the first category of data were items of information collected in interviews and at meetings with key supervisory personnel of the program.

The second category of procedures consisted of the administration of two questionnaires. The first was sent in June to classroom teachers and principals of all 171 participating schools. The second questionnaire was addressed to the 123 corrective reading teachers (see Appendix B).

Finally, copies of the Corrective Reading Program Progress Reports, kept by the corrective reading teachers, were examined and analyzed for the sample schools (see Appendix B). These records contained data on each pupil's Informal Textbook Test (ITT) scores and frequently, but not always, scored for two administrations of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading. Pupils' age, grade, date of admission to the program, hours of instruction received, absences and so on were also available in these progress reports.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Extent of Implementation - The original proposal listed 184 schools eligible for the Corrective Reading Program. Later lists contain 208 schools. Corrective reading teachers were actually assigned to 171 schools.

According to the project proposal, school eligibility was based on the economic status of the pupils attending. The criterion used was whether or not 10 per cent of the pupils met federal eligibility requirements for free lunches. All of the schools visited by the evaluation staff were in poverty areas of the city. Selection of individual pupils for the program depended on their reading retardation without further concern for whether they were, as individuals, economically deprived.

The total number of corrective reading teachers involved in the program was 123. Instructional time was fixed at 20 hours, with five additional hours per week devoted to preparation and conferences with pupils, parents, supervisors, and so on. The typical weekly schedule of a full-time teacher consisted of meeting with small groups of approximately ten children for two one-hour sessions a week. A normal teacher load was about 100 pupils in two different schools, approximately five groups of 10 pupils in each school.[1] In addition, teachers were expected to attend

---

[1] According to the local interpretation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, this schedule of personnel seemed to conform most closely to the provisions of the Act.

workshops and staff meetings, which were conducted prior to the initiation of the program and during school holidays not observed by the New York City Board of Education.

The proposal anticipated that 20,392 children would be served by the program, 89 per cent from Catholic schools and the remaining 11 per cent from Hebrew, Greek Orthodox, Lutheran, and Episcopal denominational schools. An estimate based on the total number of names on teachers' lists indicates that 18,710 children were reached at some time. Although these figures indicate that the project eventually reached 92 per cent of the children it intended to reach, it should be noted the number of children served at any one time must necessarily have been somewhat less than 92 per cent.

The records indicate that corrective reading teachers provided from 20 - 24 to 60 - 64 instructional hours; more than one quarter of them were available between 40 to 44 hours and about 24 per cent were available for between 50 and 54 hours. Approximately 46 per cent of the pupils in the sample schools received between 35 and 44 hours of instruction. Pupil turnover and absenteeism were the primary factors underlying the difference between the availability of the teacher and the hours of instruction received by the pupils.

Materials: A large variety of reading curricular materials, produced by leading publishers, were specified for use in the program. Corrective reading teachers were asked to estimate the

percentage of materials that had arrived by certain specified dates. The respondents to this questionnaire item indicated that between 50 to 60 per cent of the materials had arrived by October 17. More than half the responding teachers reported however, that it was mid-April before 90 to 100 per cent of the materials were received. About 25 per cent of the respondents reported having received less than 75 per cent of the materials by June 15. Many teachers relied on making their own materials and transporting materials from one school to another. Interview data substantiated these findings.

The quantities of each item ordered were calculated by the program coordinator to be adequate if used in a program that emphasized individualized instruction and meeting the needs of children at various phases of development. In other words, it was not expected--nor would it have been considered good practice--for all the children in a group to use the same curricular material simultaneously. Because all of the materials did not arrive at the same time, it may be assumed that the corrective reading teachers did not have the variety of materials from which selections could be made for individualized pupil instruction. It is suggested that there be improvement of the logistic support of the program and acceleration of the distribution of curricular materials.

Corrective reading teachers were asked to estimate the proportion of available materials they used in instruction, and the proportion of materials they examined for usefulness. Table 1 presents

the percentage of available materials corrective teachers indicated they had studied and examined. Table 2 summarizes the percentage of available materials used by the respondents.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF MATERIALS STUDIED AND EXAMINED FOR USEFULNESS BY CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS[a]

Percentage Studied	Corrective Reading Teachers Number	Per Cent
less than 25	0	0
26 - 50	3	9
51 - 75	4	12
76 - 100	26	79

[a] 25 respondents did not complete this item

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF AVAILABLE MATERIALS USED BY CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS[a]

Percentage Used	Corrective Reading Teachers Number	Per Cent
less than 25	2	6
26 - 50	8	24
51 - 75	13	38
76 - 100	11	32

[a] 24 respondents did not complete this item

Over 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that more than half of the items had been examined by them and almost 80 per cent indicated that they had examined at least three-quarters of the available materials (see Table 1).

Table 2 reveals that 70 per cent of the corrective reading teachers who responded, indicated they used from half to all of the materials that were available to them. Only two respondents, 6 per cent of the group, said they used less than 25 per cent of the materials. In the sample classes visited, it was observed that the corrective reading teachers tended to use the same curricular materials with all children in a given group for long periods of time.

Corrective reading teachers were also asked to list the five curricular materials found "most useful" and to indicate what they were "most useful for."[2] The five most useful items were mentioned by between 12 and 40 respondents. The frequency with which any one item was mentioned ranged from 1 to 40. Four of the five most frequently mentioned items were standardized, graded instructional materials with detailed teachers' manuals. The fifth item was a series of independent readers. "Comprehension" was consistently the most frequent use to which these materials were put. Vocabulary and word knowledge skills, and phonics were also frequently mentioned. Interpretation of these data is complicated however, because

---

[2] Since these data may be of technical interest, the new tabulations of this questionnaire item were forwarded to the program coordinator.

the distribution and availability of materials was not constant throughout all schools in the program.

The classroom teachers and the principals were questioned about the "usefulness of materials." Close to 100 per cent of both groups of respondents to this item rated the curricular materials "very useful" or "somewhat useful." In interviews and written responses, principals at participating schools expressed the wish to be able to supply similar materials to all their pupils.

Physical Work Settings: Of 126 work settings reported on by corrective reading teachers, 91 remained the same throughout the program, 26 were changed occasionally, and 9 were subject to regular change according to a schedule. The settings included 56 regular classrooms; 27 office-sized rooms; 13 unoccupied gymnasia, cafeterias, or auditoriums; and 29 "other settings" such as libraries, nurses' offices, storage rooms, a choir room, and so on.

Evaluation staff observers noted considerable variation in the ampleness, cleanliness, and appropriateness of the settings. Nevertheless, the settings were almost always the best and most appropriate that could be provided.

School Factors Influencing the Functioning of the Instructional Program

Corrective reading teachers were asked to rate a number of factors on a five-point scale. The scale ranged from "no restriction," through "serious restriction" on teacher effectiveness.

Data from 128 schools revealed that the factors of "student absence or lateness," "inaccessibility of equipment," "the physical setting," and the "setting in general" were considered only "slightly restrictive." "Administrative restrictions by the schools" and "interference by regular classroom teachers" were hardly ever found to be restrictive. The "Board of Education" seems to have been perceived as the most restrictive of the factors judged, although only 14 per cent of the responses fell into the "serious restriction" category. Interestingly, there was a very large percentage (37 per cent) of "no responses" to this item, a larger percentage than for any of the other factors. These comparisons are based on data summarized in Table 1A (see Appendix A).

In rating such items as "scheduling," "liaison of the program with the school," and "provisions for locating the program," responses of principals and classroom teachers tended to be concentrated in the "adequate" category.

In response to the question of whether time missed from regular classroom work created problems for pupils, 10 classroom teachers and principals responded that it did so for "most pupils," 10 responded that it did so for "many pupils," 65 responded that it did so for only "some pupils," and 40 responded that it "did not create problems for any pupils."

Classroom teachers and principals were asked if the Corrective Reading Program interfered regularly with any single subject for

the participating pupils. For every two respondents who indicated that the pupils frequently missed one particular subject, three reported that the program did not affect any particular subject. The program coordinator felt than an effective way to avoid this possibility was to vary the teaching schedule in the regular classroom. This procedure is more likely to be effective when the scheduling of subjects is flexible and when the number of programs in a school is small enough for the classroom teacher to keep track of the involvement of all her pupils.

Principals and classroom teachers were asked to rate the importance of several general factors that might contribute to pupils improvement in reading. Particularly notable is the fact that the Corrective Reading Program was more frequently rated as "very important" for the improvement of reading than factors that might be under the control of the school, such as the regular classroom reading program, classroom teachers, or development of the child independent of school (see Table 2A, Appendix A).

Although in general the data suggests that a rather large program was put into successful and smooth operation in the non-public schools, close scrutiny suggests that there was some disparity between what the program might have supplied and what it did in fact supply.

Firstly, not quite enough corrective reading teachers were recruited to serve all eligible schools listed. Secondly, the

materials, despite their variety and quantity, were not available in time to assure optimal use. Thirdly, not all the corrective reading teachers provided the same number of hours of instruction, and children did not always receive as many hours of instruction as seem possible. The factors contributing to the disruption of the successful and smooth implementation of a new cooperative program may be, in and of themselves, of general interest and worthy of systematic investigation in the future.

Reactions to the Corrective Reading Program

Data collected in interviews indicated that liaison between the nonpublic schools and Board of Education was effectively conducted through the channel of the appointed liaison official. There was some evidence of the use of informal channels and direct connections as well.

Occasionally, corrective reading teachers indicated that they felt isolated from their schools and colleagues. On the other hand, many noted, with appreciation, intensive efforts of the schools to promote good relations, and to encourage an exchange of views and information about pupils and educational problems.

The findings summarized in Table 3 below provide an indication of the amount of communication between corrective reading teachers and the schools in which they worked. More than half of the principals responding to the questionnaire item on frequency of meetings with their corrective reading teachers say they met with them "at least once a week."

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS INDICATING FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS WITH CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS

Frequency	Number of Respondents	
	Principals	Classroom Teachers
At least once a week	16	39
At least once a fortnight	3	6
At least once a month	4	17
Once or twice	3	29
Not at all	0	6

Interviews with the teachers in all the sample schools visited provide some data on their reactions to teaching in nonpublic schools. It should be noted that these teachers, as all teachers in the program, accepted their assignments voluntarily and no teacher objected to her assignment because of differing religious philosophy. However, three of the teachers interviewed indicated that they were opposed to public funds used in parochial schools and four other teachers were ambivalent or skeptical about what they believed were the educational philosophies, policies, and practices of these schools.

The interview data revealed that some teachers developed a strong professional commitment toward the particular children they taught. Three teachers said that they felt that their participation in the program contributed to a broadening of their attitudes and

a breakdown of their previous stereotyped impressions. The teachers who did not believe in aid to nonpublic schools began to look upon their work as aid to the ghetto children. There is some indication that the corrective reading teachers tended to develop a sense of solidarity with the schools to which they were assigned, particularly in those instances where they were well received by the school.

The Selection of Pupils for the Program

The project description did not specify procedures for pupil selection beyond stating gross levels of reading retardation. Schools were apparently free to use whatever criteria seemed appropriate. In September, classroom teachers were asked to recommend for screening a list of children who needed special reading instruction. Corrective reading teachers or, on occasion, their supervisors, administered an Informal Textbook Test as the initial measure of eligibility. The Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in reading, administered in November, was to be "more or less the final determiner of eligibility." However, this test was administered after the majority of pupils had been admitted to the program, and in some cases, test results were not available until January, long after the program was in operation. Thus, teacher recommendation and Informal Textbook Test scores instituted the primary criteria for admission to the program.

The procedure for administering the Informal Textbook Test (ITT) was described in a study guide used at a workshop session for

corrective reading teachers. The administration of the ITT consists of presenting to each child individually a graded reading passage estimated to be appropriate for him. Errors in oral reading were categorized and recorded according to a prescribed system. If the number of errors exceeded a prescribed number, another passage at a lower grade level was selected. If there were no errors, a more difficult passage was presented. The child's grade level score was defined by the grade level of the passage at which he made a number of errors fewer than the prescribed maximum. The examiner measures comprehension through devising appropriate questions about the passage.

This procedure has the potential of providing detailed diagnostic information of individual reading strengths and weaknesses. There is some question, however, as to whether this test can be used by inexperienced reading teachers lacking closely supervised training. Furthermore, without the use of standardized reading passages and questions, there is little reason to expect comparable results from one administration to another. From the point of view of good practices in tests and measurements, it was not well-advised to permit the corrective reading teachers to select the passages and questions. It is suggested instead that reading passages and comprehension questions be standardized in the future, and that the training of the corrective reading teachers include orientation, supervision, and practice in the administration and

interpretation of the ITT. In future stagings of the project, provision should be made for consultations with specialists in tests and measurements.

The notation system for scoring the Informal Textbook Test discriminates only between half-year (or five-month) levels: for example, a score of 2-1 designates the first half of the second year, while a score of 2-2 designates the second half of the second year. The Metropolitan grade equivalent scores are based on a 10 month academic year designated by means of a decimal system: a score of 2.1 designates a reading grade level equivalent to the second year, first month; a score of 2.2 indicates second year, second month. Inspection of Corrective Reading Program Progress Reports revealed instances of confusion between the two systems, making many scores impossible to interpret.

In addition, inspection of ITT data revealed negligible variability within any group of pupils, probably attributable both to the gross nature of the scores and to subjective factors entering into the evaluation of groups of pupils already recommended as retarded in reading. Comparison of the Informal Textbook Test (ITT) scores with Metropolitan data on the same pupils, for three teachers whose records were adequate for this purpose, generally revealed little correspondence between the two sets of scores. The data presented in Table 3A, Appendix A, suggests, and close inspection of the raw data confirms, that had the Metropolitan results been used in the selection, few if any pupils at the school of

teacher A would have been admitted to the program while a great many, but not all, of the pupils of teachers B and C would have been admitted. That is, the ITT scores tend to confirm more closely than the MAT to the retardation requirements for pupil eligibility suggested in the project proposal. This makes it necessary to entertain the hypothesis that prior knowledge of the requirements may have influenced the test scores.

Despite the inconsistencies and defects noted in these procedures, the personnel involved in the program expressed overall satisfaction with the selection of pupils.

Principals, classroom teachers and corrective reading teachers were asked to rate the "adequacy of the procedures" used in selecting pupils. Table 4 below presents the results of these ratings by classroom teachers and principals.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPALS AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS RATING THE ADEQUACY OF THE SELECTION PROCEDURES

	Percentage of Respondents	
Adequacy of Selection	Principals (N=26)	Classroom Teacher (N=99)
Excellent	31	12
Adequate	48	54
Needs Improvement	17	30
No Response	4	4

Approximately 80 per cent of the principals, and 66 per cent of the classroom teachers rated the selection procedures "adequate" or "excellent." A greater percentage of the classroom teachers than principals indicated that some improvement was needed, while a larger percentage of principals felt the selection procedures were "excellent."

In interviews and questionnaires, classroom teachers noted that of the pupils recommended, only the poorest were admitted. Other classroom teachers felt they had not been adequately consulted. One classroom teacher suggested that recommendations by the school be made at the end of the school year, when the classroom teacher is familiar with the work of her pupils, rather than at the beginning of the year when the teacher is familiarizing herself with a new class.

The corrective reading teachers used a different five-point scale in rating the selection procedure. The 54 teachers who responded rated the procedure as follows: "excellent" - 15 per cent; "very good" - 33 per cent; "good, but in need of improvement" - 39 per cent; "fair and in need of revision" - 11 per cent; and "inadequate" - 2 per cent. Although the majority of ratings were positive, there is a noted need for improvement.

In summary, there are many problems involved in selecting students on the basis of amount of retardation. Consideration must be given to the question of determining eligibility on the basis

of amount of retardation, which implies deviation from some standard of expectancy. Whether norms are developed from frequency distributions or expected achievement at age or grade levels, the conception implies that some children will be "advanced" and some "retarded." On the other hand, the fact that a child's scores are in the region below the mean or that he is retarded from the norm does not, in itself, in any way imply that the particular child is in need of additional instruction. Nor should it be implied that a child reading at grade level is, in fact, not retarded. For example, a nine year old in grade 2 may be performing at a grade 2 reading level but is "retarded" in respect to his age peers normally in grade 4. Perhaps, a program such as this one should concern itself with those children who could learn more, were they not confronted with the disabling factors that surround them. Such a child might not be retarded from norms at all, or his retardation may exhibit very different characteristics from another child with the same score whose retardation is the consequence of a variety of other factors (see section on the Nature of the Pupil Population). Unfortunately, currently available techniques have not been equal to the task of measuring potential, or of determining whether or not an individual could learn more in different circumstances.

Nature of the Pupil Population

As noted, use of the ITT scores resulted in admitting to the program those children who met the stated eligibility requirements.

However, had the Metropolitan reading test scores been used in determining eligibility, fewer of the children were sufficiently retarded for the program. Some children achieved Metropolitan test scores that were at or above grade level.

The corrective reading teachers were presented with a list of factors related to reading disabilities and were asked to indicate the number of children in their groups falling into these categories. Note that the list of categories were not mutually exclusive (see Table 4A, Appendix A). Corrective reading teachers rated 6572 children. Their perceptions indicated that 35 per cent were "generally slow learners," 31 per cent were "poorly motivated children or children with emotional problems," 41 per cent were "children from impoverished home backgrounds, poorly prepared for school," 20 per cent were "non-native children having difficulties with standard English," 16 per cent were "native children having difficulties with English," and 21 per cent were "pupils with previously inadequate reading instruction." These responses indicate the characteristics of the pupils include factors other than, or in addition to, reading problems.

This categorization of pupils suggests that many factors may be operative in "causing" reading disability. A program like this one will be most effective if it defines and includes those children who would most likely benefit from special small group instruction.

For example, perhaps the ethnic composition of the selected pupils merits closer attention. Although the corrective reading

teachers indicated that only 20 per cent of the total were "non-native children...," this includes a group of Spanish-speaking children who were designated as "Puerto Rican" despite the fact that Cubans, Portuguese, and persons from other Spanish countries are treated together. Classroom teachers and school administrators suggested that these groups may be diverse in their attitudes and learning problems and should not be treated as a single category.

Although inferences about the characteristics of any child on the basis of ethnic identity, may not only be inaccurate, but may be philosophically uncongenial to American education, curricular materials and the preparation of teachers must take into account the fact that ethnic differences in linguistic patterns do exist.

The percentages of students falling into each of the separate categories mentioned above demonstrates and justifies the need for special consideration of the diverse causes of reading disabilities. The Corrective Reading Program should be provided with the most accurate information about the pupils that can be obtained--even though such information must be used with extreme care and strict attention paid to its applicability in any single instance. Moreover, the diverse social and emotional causes of reading disabilities suggest that the contributions of sociologists and psychologists be used in pupil selection, in curriculum development, and in teacher training. The problem of prescribing the proper instructional program for the proper learning defect cannot be ignored.

Principals, classroom teachers, and the corrective reading teachers were asked to approximate how many pupils had improved as a result of the program, and how marked the changes were. Tables 5A and 6A summarize the responses of 102 classroom teachers, 23 principals, and 53 corrective reading teachers (Appendix A).

The data summarized in Table 5A indicates that more than half of the principals, classroom teachers, and corrective reading teachers felt that "many" or "most students" improved in their "ability to do assignments requiring reading skill" in their participation in learning activities. They also agreed that "many" or "most students" exhibited an increased "attention span" and a "general improvement in behavior and attitudes." In every instance, principals and corrective reading teachers indicated more children improved than did the responding classroom teachers.

Table 6A presents the percentage of principals, corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers who rated the improvement as "marked," "moderate" or "slight." Again, there was fairly good agreement. More than half of the respondents indicated that improvement in pupils was "moderate" or "marked." A greater percentage of corrective teachers and principals than classroom teachers rated "marked" changes in almost every area rated (see Table 6A, Appendix A).

Thirty-one children from the sample schools were interviewed by the evaluation team. The extent and content of the interviews

were limited to a small number of issues. The interviews revealed that the pupils understood they were selected for the program in order to "learn to read better." They did not feel they had lost status because they had been selected, but on the contrary, there were instances where they reported that their classmates were envious of them. Children also reported that they did not miss their regular class and invariably indicated they were benefitting from the special attention they received.

It was planned to study changes in reading achievement, as measured by the MAT in reading, for students in the 20 sample schools. From the 20 schools comprising the original sample, only 13 of them could be included in an achievement study. Two schools lost their corrective reading teacher early in the year, two more did not have initial Metropolitan Achievement scores, and an additional two schools did not complete final reports in time for inclusion in the analysis. In addition, one school was excluded because its program included only fourth grade students, and the initial Metropolitan Achievement Test in reading was administered to grades 3,5,6,7, and 8 in the nonpublic schools. Thus, the original sample of schools was reduced from twenty to thirteen.

From these 13 schools, 298 pupils, about one-third the total number in the program in the sample schools, had initial and final MAT scores. Table 5 below shows the distribution of these pupils by grade and school. Initial and final average MAT scores in

reading, for these 298 pupils, were computed and are summarized by grade in Table 7A, Appendix A. Also included in Table 7A are median scores and a range of scores for both administrations. These data seem to indicate that there was no change in achievement for these pupils. For a number of reasons that are to be described below, no conclusive interpretation whatever may be made from these data.

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF STUDENTS, BY GRADE, WITH INITIAL AND FINAL METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES IN READING

Grade	Number of Schools Attended[a]	Number of Students
3	10	127
5	8	75
6	5	38
7	7	57
8	1	1
		298

[a] The number of schools attended exceeds 13 because each school contained children in several of the grades mentioned.

The considerations which prompted the decision not to interpret the results of the available achievement tests for the 298 pupils are all matters pertaining to the validity of the data collection and the reliability and validity of the test. First, positive identification of pupils' test scores was uncertain. Teachers' lists

of scores provided only children's last names and first initials, whereas publishers' lists of MAT scores included the full first name. Since there were many instances of similar names and scores in the same school and grade, and since there were variations from record to record in the spelling of names, the matching of scores to names became questionable.

Second, there was little control over the level of the test selected for both administrations. The corrective reading teachers chose, for individual pupils, the level of the MAT used in the final administration. Thus, for example, some fifth grade students who were initially tested on the Intermediate level of the test were examined on the Elementary level at the end of the year.

A third, and no less important factor, is the fact that in some instances children participated in several other special school programs, including other reading programs. In one school, for instance, the day was divided in half. Grouping was according to the pupils' reading level during the first part of the day and instruction in reading, language arts, and related subjects was offered. During the second half of the day, the students were grouped by grade level. In a second school, a remedial reading program, as well as the Corrective Reading Program, was in progress. Thus, even had there been a change in test scores, this could not be readily attributable to the effects of the Corrective Reading Program.

Because the pupils for whom the achievement test scores are available are retarded in reading, the scores (from the low end of

the distribution) are subject to a large error of measurement and are low in reliability. The problem of validity of these scores is also questionable, especially for those pupils having difficulty with the English language.

In summary, it does not seem appropriate to make an assessment of the program on the ability of pupils to read on the basis of the available achievement test results. Despite the temptation to conclude from the objective test scores that the program was not effective, the technical problems involved permit only the interpretation that the test results are inconclusive. The judgments of principals, classroom teachers, and the corrective reading teachers may be taken to mean that the program was well received, functioned smoothly, provided the participants with a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction, and resulted in a feeling that there was improvement for many schools.

Any future study of the program must be designed as part of the program and should include sensitive measures of considerably greater sophistication and appropriateness in order to confirm or refute these tentative results.

Corrective Reading Teachers

Approximately 90 per cent of the corrective reading teachers were recruited from the graduates of the Intensive Teacher Training

Program (ITTP) conducted during the summer of 1966.[3] In addition to ITTP graduates, some teachers had been recruited from among the ranks of retired teachers from the public schools. Approximately 15 per cent of the teachers responding to the questionnaire listed Education as their graduate or undergraduate major. (Some teachers were now beginning to study for a master's degree in Education.) Others had courses in such related topics as reading, English, linguistics, developmental psychology, and foreign languages. More than half of the respondents reported that they had spent more than three-quarters of their lives in New York City, and most of these indicated that they held substitute or provisional licenses.

In order to prepare the personnel for their roles as corrective reading teachers a training program was conducted. This program consisted of a series of workshops which took place prior to the start of instruction, after school hours, and during holidays that were observed by the nonpublic schools. The workshops were conducted by the program coordinator, corrective reading supervisors, and consultants, including Board of Education specialists in various areas and representatives of the publishers whose materials were to be used. Each corrective reading teacher, on

---

[3] According to the criteria for admission to the ITTP, these teachers had little or no prior experience in teaching nor any substantial teacher training outside of the ITTP. These trainees tended to have good college records and scores on standardized aptitude and achievement tests. Lohman, M.A., et. al. An Evaluation of the Intensive Teacher Training Program, The City University of New York, June 1967.

the average, attended 15 meetings.

Copies of agenda, minutes, handouts, record forms, and background materials used at the workshop sessions were made available to the evaluation team. The meetings were concerned both with administrative procedures, such as personnel forms, teachers' time cards, pupils' attendance records, orientation to the nonpublic schools, structure of the program, as well as substantive matters. These substantive matters included objectives of the program, causes of reading retardation, testing and administration of the Informal Textbook Test, selecting materials, working with children, examination of curricular materials, and so on.

According to the program coordinator, the training of the corrective reading teachers included supervisory classroom observations in addition to the workshops. The field supervisors made suggestions, demonstrated techniques in the classroom, and also prepared detailed, confidential reports on each teacher's performance and progress.

On their questionnaire, corrective reading teachers were asked to rate aspects of their training on a five-point scale ranging from "not useful at all" to "most useful." "Demonstration lessons by supervisors," "conferences and chats with colleagues," and "critiques by supervisors" were rated most useful. The items rated next most highly useful were "demonstrations by special consultants" and "conferences with supervisors." The categories rated as "moderately useful" included: "your teacher-training program;" "workshops

for the Corrective Reading Program;" "academic courses in reading;" "other subject;" "study of special bulletins supplied by the program;" and "reading of magazines, journals, and books."

Interviews with the sample of corrective reading teachers indicated uncertainty both about knowing the field of corrective reading, and about their own ability to give students the specialized instruction. In the interviews and on the questionnaire, corrective reading teachers indicated a need for more supervisory sessions, which they felt were the most useful training techniques. They felt that one or two supervisory visits were not enough to train them in the skills they needed. The program coordinator indicated that a strategy had been developed of hiring only the most qualified supervisors, thus limiting the number that could be recruited in the time available, although funds were adequate to provide some additional personnel. The coordinator anticipated that had more but poorer supervisors been engaged the complaint might have been about the inadequacy, rather than the infrequency of these visits. Perhaps there is a small margin within which standards as to the qualifications of the supervisors might be lowered in order to increase the number of supervisors.

A wide range of teaching performance was observed by the evaluation staff. Characteristics of performance were recorded on a standardized form which included: ability to engage the class, appropriateness of methods and materials, professionalism, and

relation to children (Appendix B).

Most of the 14 teachers observed were rated as "average," or above, although there were instances of below average performance. Two teachers were rated "superior," four were rated "above average," and the remaining four were rated "below average." None of the teachers received an "unsatisfactory" overall rating by the observers.

Information about prior teaching experience was available for 13 of these 14 teachers. All four teachers that had been rated "below average" were inexperienced, while none of the teachers with previous experience were rated in this way. Both of the teachers rated as "superior" had had special training in the teaching of reading. One of these had prior teacher experience while the other had not.[4]

Observers were unanimous in noting that the corrective reading teachers had difficulty in subgrouping and individualizing instruction. Corrective teachers also indicated that this was a problem area for them. About 70 per cent of the questionnaire respondents estimated that they spent 75 per cent or more time in whole group instruction, while 80 per cent indicated that they felt whole group instruction should occupy less than 50 per cent of available

---

[4] While there are too few cases to permit conclusions, the data suggest a hypothesis for future investigation. Since "average" or "above average" teachers may be either experienced or inexperienced, and since "below average" teachers tend to be inexperienced, perhaps experience is partly a selection factor. That is: is it possible that "below average" teachers either tend to improve or leave the profession?

classroom time. Corrective reading teachers attributed this discrepancy to their inexperience and lack of knowledge of specific techniques and procedures. Some respondents indicated that they felt they could individualize better in the future as a result of this experience.

Classroom teachers and principals at participating schools were asked to rate corrective reading teachers' "capability," "cooperativeness," and "training." The preponderant majority of respondents rated the corrective reading teachers highly "capable," "cooperative," and "well trained." The ratings are presented in Table 8A (Appendix A).

In general, it can be concluded that the program succeeded in putting into the field a corps of teachers who were on a par with the average teacher who might be observed in any school system, and a corps of teachers whose motivation for self-improvement is dynamic enough to permit the expectation of further improvement and success.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Corrective Reading Program in the nonpublic schools was essentially a replication of the Board of Education's program in the public schools. The evaluation found that generally:

1. The program functioned smoothly, liaison was effective, and participating schools and corrective reading personnel were favorably disposed toward the program.
2. The original proposal was generally well implemented, with the exception of the late arrival of some curricular materials, and the inability to recruit as many corrective teachers as required to serve all eligible schools.
3. The achievement scores that were available did not indicate any improvement in reading ability. However, because of many questions of reliability and validity about the tests used, the administration, scoring and record keeping, no attempt was made to interpret these results. Therefore, based on these measures, no conclusions about program effectiveness will be made. Subjective judgments of corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers and principals in the participating schools suggest improvement in pupils' ability to read.
4. The corps of corrective teachers were on a par with beginning teachers who might be observed in any school system, and were judged as competent by the teachers and principals in the participating schools.

A number of recommendations were either stated or implied in this report; these recommendations are recapitulated and expanded:

1. Provision should be made in the future for an evaluation design that permits comparison between treatments, and the isolation of factors that contribute to the improvement of reading. The cost of such pre-planning would be negligible when one considers the value of the increased knowledge that might be gained. The present state of corrective reading does not seem to be advanced enough to warrant the allegation that placing a child in a control group increases his deprivation.

2. A broader approach to the problems of improving reading is warranted. Consideration should be given to a design that would integrate programs in speech, language arts, and corrective reading. The known relations between skill in reading and linguistic functioning suggest that a program incorporating speech, language arts and corrective reading may prove to be more effective than a separate program for each.

3. More attention should be paid to the selection procedure in terms of attempting to identify pupils most likely to benefit from the particular program.

4. Recommendations of classroom teachers should be allowed to carry considerable weight in the selection procedure. The value of their recommendations is, of course, contingent on their opportunity to observe pupils over an adequate period of time, an awareness of the problems of identifying children who could learn more than they do in their present circumstances, and complete information about the

remedial program for which selection is made.

5. Further, a marked improvement could be made if a more formalized diagnostic test analogous to the Informal Textbook Test, were developed and administered by a corps of experienced specialists. Testing should be oriented toward identifying pupils for the programs, diagnosing effects, and prescribing appropriate instructional procedures to be followed by corrective reading teachers.

6. The diverse causes of reading retardation indicate the necessity of utilizing the contributions of sociologists and psychologists in selection of students, in planning curriculum, and in training teachers.

7. Efforts should be made to improve the logistic support of the program by accelerating the distribution of curricular materials.

8. High priority should be assigned to providing more supervisory sessions for corrective reading teachers, and more training in individualized instruction.

A program like Corrective Reading will be more effective with a higher percentage of pupils only when pupils more likely to benefit from the special instruction are selected for participation. The criteria of social fairness and bureaucratic efficiency are not the only ones to be applied since these criteria, in isolation, may detract from the efficiency of the entire program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A report, such as the one submitted here, is inevitably a group effort. Mrs. Sema Brainin, Mrs. Barbara Levy, and Mrs. Rosaline Ritter participated in planning and data collection. Mrs. Brainin and Mrs. Levy also contributed to the data processing and analysis. A team consisting of Selwyn Fraiman, Jeffrey Glauber, Jeffrey Issler, and Alan Werner executed the tallying.

Personnel at the Center for Urban Education facilitated the evaluation. Dr. Rita Senf was most helpful and cooperative in making available instruments, data, notes, space, valuable impressions, and access to channels of communication. Mr. George Weinberg provided valuable assistance in relations with the New York City Board of Education, in locating sources of information, and in editorial matters. Mr. Joseph Krevisky supplied the administrative support and a climate conducive to free inquiry and vigorous study.

Mrs. Ethel Patricia Cutler, coordinator of the program for Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Regular Nonpublic Day Schools, also merits special thanks both for her cooperativeness with the evaluation study and for the time taken from her busy schedule to supply necessary information.

Appendix A

Table 1A

Percentage of Corrective Reading Teachers' (CRTs)

Rating Restrictions (N=128)

Factors	Per Cent Responding to Degree of Restriction: None	Slight	Some	Frequent	Serious	No Response
Frequent Absence of Students	42	33	11	3	5	6
Frequent Lateness of Students	55	17	9	5	2	12
Inaccessibility of Equipment	55	19	8	5	8	5
Restrictions in Physical Setting	49	23	10	4	9	5
Administrative Restrictions at the School	81	9	0	4	1	5
Administrative Restrictions by the Board	36	12	1	0	14	37
Interference by the Teachers at the School	81	8	2	2	1	6
The Setting in General	60	20	9	5	5	1

Table 2A

Classroom Teachers' and Principals' Ratings of Importance

of Various Factors Contributing to The Improvement of Reading

Factors		Per Cent Responding to Degree of Importance					
		Very	Rather	Some-What	Slight-ly	Irrel-evant	No Response
Regular classroom reading program	Teachers (N=99)	66	21	7	3	0	3
	Principals (N=26)	50	31	11	0	0	8
Corrective reading program	Teachers (N=103)	77	15	6	1	0	1
	Principals (N=23)	87	9	0	0	0	4
Teaching in the classroom	Teachers (N=102)	67	24	5	2	0	2
	Principals (N=24)	50	33	4	0	0	13
Development of child independent of school	Teachers (N=98)	58	26	8	1	4	3
	Principals (N=23)	52	27	13	0	0	8

Table 3A

Comparison of Ranges of Initial Informal Textbook Test (ITT) Scores With Initial Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in Reading Scores For Three Teachers

Teacher	N in Group	Range of Initial Scores: ITT	Range of Initial Scores: MAT
Teacher A Group			
Grade 3	10	preprimer - 1-1	2.3 - 3.5
Grade 3 and 4	9	1-1 - 1-1	2.1 - 3.9
Grade 4 and 5	8	2-1 - 3-0	2.9 - 4.5
Grade 4 and 5	8	2-1 - 3-1	3.0 - 5.1
Teacher B Group			
Grade 3	12	Nonreader - primer	2.0 - 3.0
Grade 6	10	3-1 - 4-0	3.7 - 5.6
Grade 6 and 8	7	1-1 - 3-1	3.3 - 3.9
Teacher C Group			
Grade 3	12	preprimer - 1-1	2.0 - 2.9
Grade 4	9	3-1 - 3-2	2.4 - 3.1
Grade 5	9	3-1 - 3-5	3.1 - 3.7
Grade 5	9	3-2 - 4-2	3.1 - 4.9

Table 4A

Number and Percentage of Pupils Assigned by CRTs to Factors Related to Reading Disabilities

Cause of Disability	Pupils	
	Number[a]	Per Cent
Generally "slow learners"	2320	35
Poorly motivated children or children with emotional problems	2034	31
Children from impoverished home backgrounds poorly prepared for school	2715	41
Children with physical handicaps not previously diagnosed	155	2
Children with physical handicaps affecting reading despite ongoing medical attention	89	1
Non-native children having difficulties with English	1311	20
Native children having difficulties with standard English	1023	16
Pupils with previously inadequate reading instruction	1386	21
Total number of children reported on	6572	

a Since the categories were not mutually exclusive, the total percentage exceeds 100 and the numbers total more than 6572.

Table 5A

Percentage of Classroom Teachers', Principals' and Corrective Reading Teachers' (CRTs) Rating the Number of Pupils Improved on Four Factors

(N = Classroom Teachers = 102; Principals = 23; CRTs = 53)

Factors	Respondent	Percentage Responding: Most Students	Many Students	Few Students	No Response
Improvement in Ability To Do Assignments Requiring Skills in Reading	Classroom Teachers	18	42	27	3
	Principals	26	56	13	4
	CRTs	34	48	6	5
Participation in Learning Activities (Enthusiasm for school, attendance etc.)	Classroom Teachers	14	33	38	7
	Principals	26	34	22	17
	CRTs	18	54	14	8
Increased Attention Span	Classroom Teachers	16	29	37	6
	Principals	17	60	9	13
	CRTs	13	49	25	6
General Improvement in Behavior and Attitude	Classroom Teachers	17	22	38	11
	Principals	17	43	34	4
	CRTs	24	42	24	2

Table 6A

Percentage of Classroom Teachers', Principals' and Corrective Reading Teachers' (CRTs) Rating the Degree of Pupil Improvement on Four Factors

(N = Classroom Teachers = 102; Principals = 23; CRTs = 53)

		Percentage Responding			
	Respondent	Marked	Moderate	Slight	No Response
Improvement in Ability To do Assignments Requiring Skills in Reading	Classroom Teachers	14	53	16	1
	Principals	17	60	13	9
	Corrective Reading Teachers	21	56	6	8
Participation in Learning Activities (Enthusiasm for school, attendance, etc)	Classroom Teachers	14	43	18	5
	Principals	30	34	9	22
	Corrective Reading Teachers	34	45	6	5
Increased Attention Span	Classroom Teachers	14	40	27	2
	Principals	26	39	22	13
	Corrective Reading Teachers	22	49	13	6
General Improvement in Behavior and Attitude	Classroom Teachers	10	33	32	7
	Principals	22	43	30	4
	Corrective Reading Teachers	37	43	10	3

Table 7A

Mean and Median Scores on The Initial and Final Administration of The Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in Reading For Sample Pupils (N = 298*)

	Grade			
	3	5	6	7
Number of Pupils	127	75	38	57
Mean Score				
Initial	2.7	3.7	3.8	4.8
Final	2.6	3.8	3.8	4.6
Median Score				
Initial	2.8	3.6	3.8	4.5
Final	2.6	3.8	3.9	4.5
Range of Scores				
Initial	1.8-4.1	2.4-5.2	3.2-5.2	3.0-8.0
Final	1.8-4.1	1.5-7.6	2.2-5.5	1.8-7.2

*Note: N in Grade 8 = 1

Table 8A

Principals' and Classroom Teachers' Ratings of Capability,
Cooperativeness and Adequacy of Training
of Corrective Reading Teachers

Ratings by:	Percentage Ratings Corrective Teachers								
	Capable			Cooperative			Well Trained		
	Very	Fairly	Not at all	Very	Fairly	Not at all	Very	Fairly	Not at all
Classroom teachers	86	11	3	95	4	1	79	18	3
Principals	82	13	5	97	3	0	76	24	0

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS

List of Instruments

Interview of Teacher	B1
Interview of Principal	B3
Children's Interview	B5
Interview of Regular Classroom Teachers	B6
Individual Lesson Observation	B9
Teachers Questionnaire	B12
Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers and Principals	B22

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd St.
New York, N. Y. 10036

Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public School

Teacher_____ School_____

Date_____ Principal_____

Observer_____

Interview of Corrective Reading Teacher

Career Information

Ed. Background
Prof. Background
Special Preparation

Key: - Circle the appropriate number, where appropriate: 1. unsatisfactory, 2. satisfactory with reservations, 3. satisfactory, 4. satisfactory with positive endorsement, 5. highly enthusiastic. If you have no basis on which to judge a particular item circle 0. Beneath each item give any supporting evidence.

I. Attitude toward	Corrective Teacher's Evaluation					
A. Program	1	2	3	4	5	0
comment						
B. Teaching Staff	1	2	3	4	5	0
comment						
C. Materials	1	2	3	4	5	0
comment						

D. Facilities 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

E. Students-Belief in Educability 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

F. In-Service Training 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

II. Structure and Operations

A. Schedule 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

B. Communication 1 2 3 4 5 0

1. Teaching staff

comment

2. Supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

3. Bd. of Education 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

4. Other

III Recommendations of C.R.J.

IV Evaluation's judgment of

A. Professional awareness of C.R.J.'s cognizance of educational objectives and procedures 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment

B. Emotional reaction of assignment to non-public school

comment 1 2 3 4 5 0

C. Teacher's attitude as revealed in interview 1 2 3 4 5 0

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

Corrective Reading Program in the Non-Public Schools

Teacher:_____ School:_____

Principal:_____ Observer:_____

Time & Place of Interview:_____

Interview of Principal

Key: For interview rating score, circle the appropriate number: 1-unsatisfactory; 2-satisfactory with reservations; 3-satisfactory; 4-satisfactory with positive endorsement; 5-highly enthusiastic. If you have no basis on which to judge a particular item, circle 0, meaning not scorable. In the blank space underneath each item, please comment on what led to your rating, cite the incidents you observed, etc.

I. Attitude toward: (Principal's own rating)

A. Program: 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

B. Corrective Reading Teacher: 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

C. Materials 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

D. Facilities 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

E. Target Population: (non-rateable)

1. Composition of Corrective Reading Group

Description:

2. Composition of Surrounding Area

Description:

III Structure and Operations

A. Schedule 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

b. Size of Classes 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

c. Number of Students in Program 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

d. Communications 1 2 3 4 5 0

1. Staff - Corrective Reading Teacher 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

2. Board of Education 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

3. Parents 1 2 3 4 5 0

comment:

4. Other

IV Recommendations for Program:

V Evaluation's Judgment of Principal's Attitude:

(use reverse side for full commentary)

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Corrective Reading Program in the Non-Public Schools

Children's Interview Questionnaire

School__ _____ _ _____ **Principal**_____ _ _____

Teacher_____ ___ __ _ ____ **Time & Place Interviewed**_____

Group_____

Instructions: Give as many illustrative comments about child as you can - try to obtain as much detailed information as possible.

I. Warm-up:

1. What are you reading now?
2. What do you like best about the story?
3. What activities have you had on story?
4. Do you have any books at home? (What are some names?)
5. What kinds of stories do you like to read?
6. Do you ever take books out of the library? What kind?
7. Do you enjoy reading now more than you used to?

II. Questions on Class

8. Has this class helped you a lot? Does the teacher help you?
9. Do you know why you come to this class?
10. Do any of the children from your regular class come with you? (Who are they?)
11. How do you know when it's time to come to this class? (Do your regular classmates say they'd like to come? What do they say?)
12. What does your class do while you're here? (Do you miss that?)
13. Do you have reading in your regular classroom?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Title I Evaluations

Interview
of
Regular Classroom Teachers

of

Released Children to Corrective Reading Program

1. How many students in your class are released for corrective reading?

_____

2. Of these students can you judge whether any general growth occurred in the following:

0 = no judgment 1 = not at all 2 = slight change 3 = noticeable change 4 = considerable change

a) Increased ability to do assignments requiring reading skills 0 1 2 3 4

b) Gain in participation in learning activities (more enthusiasm for school, better attendance) 0 1 2 3 4

c) Improvement in personal and social attitudes (behavior, attitude to group.) 0 1 2 3 4

d) Increase in attention span. 0 1 2 3 4

3. Within the released time for your children in the Corrective Reading Program, what subject areas are scheduled for his grade class?

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

4. Does the loss of this time create any conflicts within the child?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____.

If answer is yes, have you any suggestions for overcoming or alleviating?

_____

_____

_____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Title I Evaluations

5. Within your grade class is there an opportunity for these released children to participate in activities that should aid their growth in reading accomplishment?

Yes_____ No._____

If yes, please specify: _____

_____

6. Circle the following number for rating the effectiveness of the areas listed. State suggestions for change or improvement if appropriate.

0 = Don't know 1 = unsatisfactory 2 = satisfactory 3 = need of improvement 4 = excellent

a) Procedure for selecting students 0 1 2 3 4

Comment: _____

_____

b) Liaison with Corrective Reading teacher 0 1 2 3 4

Comment: _____

_____

c) Schedule for children - number of hours per week 0 1 2 3 4

Comment: _____

_____

d) Released time of day for children 0 1 2 3 4

Comment: _____

_____

e) Achievement of students 0 1 2 3 4

Comment: _____

_____

f) Other - Comment _____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Title I Evaluations

7. Are there any materials, methods or procedures for the corrective reading class that you like to adopt in your regular instructional program?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

If yes, please comment: _____

_____

_____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

Corrective Reading in the Non-Public Schools
Individual Lesson Observation

Teacher_____ School_____

Grade or Subject_____ Principal_____

Date_____ Observer_____

For each numbered item below, please circle a number between 1 and 5 to indicate the extent to which the described behavior is shown. If you have no basis on which to judge a particular item, circle 0, meaning not scorable. In the blank space underneath each item, please comment on what led to your rating, cite specific incidents you observed, etc. 1-unsatisfactory, 2-below average, 3-average, 4-above average, 5-superior

To what extent:	Little 1 2 3 4 5 Much	Not Scorable 0
1. Has the teacher attempted to make the classroom look attractive in a way that is appropriate to the children's age level? Comment:		
2. Are the children responsive to the teacher? Comment:	1 2 3 4 5	0
3. Do the pupils show interest and involvement in the class activities? Comment:	1 2 3 4 5	0
4. Do the children show interest in the materials presented by the teacher? Comment:	1 2 3 4 5	0
5. Is the teacher's use of language appropriate for the children? (For example, does she make adaptations for children who have language difficulties?) Comment:	1 2 3 4 5	0
6. Is the pacing of the learning activities appropriate for the pupils? Comment:	1 2 3 4 5	0
7. Does the teacher show that she can vary her teaching approach to meet the needs of particular pupils? Comment:	1 2 3 4 5	0

To what extent:

		Little				Much	Not scorable
8.	Does the teacher encourage questioning, suggestions, and other evidences of pupil initiative? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
9.	Is the lesson part of a continuous process? That is, to what extent does the teacher refer to prior learnings and furnish leads to future learning? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
10.	Does the teacher check on whether the pupils have acquired the knowledge she has been teaching? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
11.	Does the teacher set standards for the children's behavior which are conducive to learning? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
12.	Does the teacher show respect for the children as individuals? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
13.	Does the teacher show awareness of special needs of individual children? (For example, show consideration of a child's possible fatigue, hunger, or need for special work different from the regular class work.) Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
14.	Does the teacher attempt to relate the class work to the pupils' environment and life experiences? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
15.	Does the teacher seem to enjoy teaching? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	0
		Poor				Excellent	
16.	Give your overall evaluation of the teaching-learning situation you observed. Comment:	1	2	3	4	5	

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

June 14, 1967

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluation
Title I

Dear Colleague:

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) which provided the funds for the Corrective Reading Program in which you participated requires an evaluation of the program. The Center for Urban Education is under contract with the New York City Board of Education to provide an impartial assessment and the feed-back necessary for improving future stagings of the program.

The enclosed questionnaire is an integral part of this evaluation since the corrective reading teacher is the pivotal component of the program. As researchers, we recognize our responsibility for preserving the privacy of the sources of our information and you are assured that no report will be made which will permit the identification of specific schools or individuals.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope in the next two or three days.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Aaron Carton

Aaron Carton, Ph.D.
Chairman
Evaluation of Corrective Reading
Program in Non-Public Schools

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

EVALUATION OF TITLE I CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS TITLE I

Questionnaire for Corrective Reading Teachers

Wherever necessary use back of each page to complete answers or add your comments.

1. How many schools are you assigned to?_____

   Were there any changes in your assignment or scheduling? Yes:___No:____

   If yes, please indicate number and nature of changes.

   _____

   _____

   Please designate the name of each school to which you are or were assigned. (This identification is necessary for relating components of the Program to each other and will be deleted after analysis is completed.)

   A. _____

   B. _____

   C. _____

2. Check ONE of the following for each school to which you were assigned:

	School A	School B	School C
The space in which I teach corrective reading has been the same place throughout the semester.	( )	( )	( )
Occasionally changed.	( )	( )	( )
Changed according to regular schedule.	( )	( )	( )
Changed each time I came to the school.	( )	( )	( )

Check ONE of the following for each school to which you were assigned:

	School A	School B	School C
A regular classroom.	( )	( )	( )
Office size - (Smaller than a classroom).	( )	( )	( )
An unoccupied gym, cafeteria or auditorium.	( )	( )	( )
A gym, cafeteria or auditorium where other activities are taking place.	( )	( )	( )
Other (specify)_____	( )	( )	( )

_____

3. In the spaces provided, please enter the appropriate numbers of students for each of the categories specified below. (Enter zeros, if necessary.)

   A. Total number originally accepted for your groups. _____

   B. Total number added. _____

   C. Total number dropped or released. _____

4. In the spaces provided, please enter the approximate numbers of pupils excused from the program for the reasons specified. (Enter zeros, if necessary.)

   A. Pupils who have come up to grade level in program. _____

   B. Pupils whose original admission was later considered an error in assessment. _____

   C. Pupils showing no promise of responding. _____

   D. Unmanageable disciplinary problems. _____

   E. Pupils withdrawn from the school. _____

   F. Pupils withdrawn by the school. (Indicate reasons or write "unknown.") _____

   G. Other (Specify)_____ _____

   _____

5. Please indicate the approximate number of your pupils that belong to each of the categories listed below. NOTE: Since any child may be in need of corrective reading for more than one reason, the total number of pupils shown here may exceed the total number of your pupils.

1. Generally slow learners. _____
2. Poorly motivated children and other emotional problems. _____
3. Children from impoverished home backgrounds poorly prepared for school. _____
4. Children with physical handicaps (in vision, hearing) not previously diagnosed. _____
5. Children with physical handicaps affecting reading despite ongoing medical attention. _____
6. Non-native children having difficulties with English. _____
7. Native children having difficulties with standard English. _____
8. Pupils with previously inadequate reading instruction. _____

6. Please indicate the degree to which each of the factors listed below limited your effectiveness as a corrective reading teacher. Use the numbers 1 through 5 to indicate the following:

1 . . . Did not restrict my work at all.
2 . . . Restricted my work slightly or occasionally.
3 . . . Sometimes restricted my work noticeably.
4 . . . Frequently restricted my work markedly.
5 . . . A very serious source of restriction.

(Use designations as in question 2)

	School A	School B	School C
Frequent absence of students.	( )	( )	( )
Frequent lateness of students.	( )	( )	( )
Inaccessibility of equipment.	( )	( )	( )
Restrictions in the physical setting.	( )	( )	( )
Administrative restriction at the school.	( )	( )	( )
Administrative restrictions from the Board. (Mark only under "School A")	( )	( )	( )

6. Cont.

	School A	School B	School C
Interference by teachers at the school.	( )	( )	( )
The setting in general.	( )	( )	( )
Other (Specify)_____	( )	( )	( )

---

7. Please rate each of the aspects of the Corrective Reading Program listed below using the number 1 through 5 to indicate the following:

1 . . . Inadequate should be entirely revised or discarded.
2 . . . Fair needs considerable revision.
3 . . . Good in need of some improvement but basically satisfactory.
4 . . . Very good - slight improvement needed.
5 . . . Excellent - changes would weaken it.

A. Procedure for selecting students. _____

B. Organization of lines of responsibility. _____

C. Liaison among personnel components of the program. _____

D. Teachers' schedules. _____

E. Student scheduling. _____

F. Record keeping procedures. _____

G. Supervisory procedures and in-service training. _____

H. What other aspects of the Program do you have comments about?

_____

_____

Please use the space below for comments and suggestions you may have about aspects of the program you have rated as unsatisfactory. (You may designate each aspect by the letter preceding it, in the list above.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Please rate each of the following items for their usefulness to developing your effectiveness as a corrective reading teacher. Use numbers 1 through 5 to indicate the following:

1 . . . Not at all useful.
2 . . . Slightly or occasionally useful.
3 . . . Moderately or relatively frequently useful.
4 . . . Generally and quite often useful.
5 . . . Among the items most useful to your teaching skill.
X . . . If item does not apply to you.

	RATING
Teacher training program	_____
Workshop for corrective reading program.	_____
Academic courses in reading.	_____
Other subjects.	_____
Demonstration lessons by supervisors.	_____
Demonstrations by special consultants.	_____
Critiques by your teaching by supervisors.	_____
Conferences with supervisors.	_____
Conferences and chats with colleagues.	_____
Study of special bulletins supplied by Program	_____
Reading of magazines, journals and books.	_____

List some titles of works on reading you have found most useful.

_____

_____

_____

Comments (Optional):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Please check the appropriate spaces indicating your educational and professional background.

A. Amount of time in corrective reading program. Full-time___Part-time___

B. Nature of preparation for teaching. Regular teacher education program_____ ITTP_____Other (Specify)_____

_____

C. List all academic degrees, including B.A. and major area of study.

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Partially completed degree(s) _____

_____

D. Nature of license (check more than one if appropriate)

Regular_____ Substitute_____Provisional_____

E. Number of years of teaching experience. _____

F. Are you retired. Yes___No____

G. Approximately what percent of your life have you spent in New York City?_____

H. Please check the areas in which you have taken courses, exclusive of the workshop, for this program.

Teaching of reading ____

English composition ____

English literature _____

Linguistics and/or philology _____

Child Development ____

Psychology (Exclusive of child development) _____

Foreign Language _____

Which one(s)? _____

Other relevant courses. (Specify) _____

_____

10. Rate each of the following aids to your teaching using numbers 1 through 5.

    1 - "Least useful" to 5 - "Most useful"

    Plan books _____ Audio-visual aids _____

    Printed curricular material in general _____

    Other (Specify) _____

11. In column (A) please indicate the percentage of time you think you actually spent in each of the categories of teaching listed and in column (B) indicate the percentages of time you feel you ought to have spent in each of the categories.

	A Actually Spent Time	B Ought to Have Spent
Whole Group Instruction	_____	_____
Sub-grouped Procedures (While some children worked independently)	_____	_____
Individualized Teaching (While the remaining children worked independently)	_____	_____

In a few phrases, please give some explanations for your opinions and for any discrepancies that might exist between columns A and B.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Please check the appropriate box to describe your judgement of the effect of the Corrective Reading Program on the pupils in your classes.

	Most Students	Many Students	Few Students	No Judgement
A. Improvement in ability to do assignments requiring reading skills was seen in:	( )	( )	( )	( )

A-1. This improvement generally was: Marked ( ) Moderate ( ) Slight ( ) No Judgement ( )

B. Participation in learning activities (more enthusiasm for school, better attendance,etc.) was seen in: Most Students ( ) Many Students ( ) Few Students ( ) No Judgement ( )

B-1. This improvement generally was: Marked ( ) Moderate ( ) Slight ( ) No Judgement ( )

C. Increase in attention span (Sustained study or attention to material presented) was seen in: Most Students ( ) Many Students ( ) Few Students ( ) No Judgement ( )

C-1. This increase generally was: Marked ( ) Moderate ( ) Slight ( ) No Judgement ( )

D. General improvement in behavior and attitude was seen in: Most Students ( ) Many Students ( ) Few Students ( ) No Judgement ( )

D-1. This improvement generally was: Marked ( ) Moderate ( ) Slight ( ) No Judgement ( )

E. If you have noticed any other positive effects of the program, will you write them in the spaces below, indicating whether most, some, or few pupils were affected and whether the effect was marked, moderate or slight.

Effect	No. of Pupils Affected	Degree
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

F. If you have noticed any negative effects that might be attributed to the program, write them here, indicating whether most, some, or few pupils were affected and whether the effect was generally marked, moderate or slight.

Effect	No. of Pupils Affected	Degree
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

12 F-Cont.

Effect	No. of Pupils Affected	Degree

G. Circle the grade level(s) to which your responses pertain:
2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,

13. Please indicate under the dates shown below the approximate percentage of officially supplied curricular materials that had arrived for use by that date.

October 15	December 15	February 15	April 15	June 15
_____%	_____%	_____%	_____%	_____%

14. What proportion of the curricular materials that were supplied to you by the program did you have an opportunity to use?

_____

_____

15. What proportion of curricular items that were supplied to you did you have an opportunity to examine and study for their usefulness?

_____

_____

16. Please list below the five curricular items you found most useful in your work and indicate what they were most useful for.

Title	Use

17. Additional comments on curricular materials._____

_____

Thank you for your cooperation.

B21

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluation
Title I

May 15, 1967

Dear Colleague:

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provided the federal funds for the Corrective Reading Program in progress at your school requires an evaluation of the program. The Center for Urban Education is conducting such an evaluation as an impartial agent for the New York City Board of Education. In this evaluation, we hope not only to determine the effect of the program upon pupils, but also to analyze how the various components of the program operate and relate to each other so that we may be able to provide feed-back for improving the design of future programs.

Your responses to the enclosed questionnaire are an essential aspect of the study and your suggestions are expected to be most valuable.

Identification of this questionnaire by the school it pertains to is necessary in order to study how each aspect of the program effects the rest. We are nevertheless mindful of our responsibility to keep all specific sources of data confidential.

We have tried to keep the number of questions to a minimum and we hope that no more than 15 minutes from your busy schedule will be required. Will you please return your completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Aaron Carton

Aaron Carton, Ph.D.
Chairman
Evaluation of Corrective Reading
Program in Non-Public Schools

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluation
TITLE I

EVALUATION OF TITLE I CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers and Principals

1. Please check the appropriate box to describe your judgement of the effect of the Corrective Reading Program on the pupils of <u>your class</u> who participated in it.

A. Improvement in ability to do assignments requiring reading skills was seen in:	Most Students ( )	Many Students ( )	Few Students ( )	No Judgement ( )
A-1 This improvement generally was:	Marked ( )	Moderate ( )	Slight ( )	No Judgement ( )
B. Participation in learning activities (more enthusiasm for school, better attendance, etc.) was seen in:	Most Students ( )	Many Students ( )	Few Students ( )	No Judgement ( )
B-1 This improvement generally was:	Marked ( )	Moderate ( )	Slight ( )	No Judgement ( )
C. Increase in attention span (sustained study or attention to material presented) was seen in:	Most Students ( )	Many Students ( )	Few Students ( )	No Judgement ( )
C-1 This increase generally was:	Marked ( )	Moderate ( )	Slight ( )	No Judgement ( )
D. General improvement in behavior and attitude was seen in:	Most Students ( )	Many Students ( )	Few Students ( )	No Judgement ( )
D-1 This improvement generally was:	Marked ( )	Moderate ( )	Slight ( )	No Judgement ( )

E. If you have noticed any other positive effects of the program, will you write them in the spaces below, indicating whether most, some, or few pupils were affected and whether the effect was marked, moderate or slight.

Effect	No. of Pupils Affected	Degree

F. If you have noticed any negative effects that might be attributed to the program, write them here, indicating whether most, some or few pupils were affected and whether the effect was generally marked, moderate or slight.

Effect	No. of Pupils Affected	Degree

G. Circle the grade level(s) to which your responses pertain: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

2. A. Did children in the Corrective Reading Program miss any one subject more than any other?

( ) No ( ) Yes Which? _____

B. Did missing time from regular class create problems for: (check appropriate box).

( ) Most Pupils ( ) Many Pupils ( ) Some Pupils ( ) No Pupils

C. Do you have any suggestions or procedures you may have used for alleviating these problems?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Please indicate below your judgement of the relative importance of each <u>general factor</u> listed in improving the reading skills of children who require Corrective Reading.

	Very Important	Rather Important	Somewhat Important	Slightly Important	Irrelevant
A. The regular classroom reading program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
B. The Corrective Reading Program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
C. Teaching in the Classroom	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
D. Development in the child occuring independently of the school	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
E. Other (specify)					
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS / Teachers - Principals

4. Indicate below your judgement of the relative usefulness or possible harmfulness of each aspect of the Corrective Reading Program in improving reading skills.

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Irrelevant Irrelevant	Somewhat Harmful	Very Harmful
A. The smaller groups	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
B. The availability of a variety of materials	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
C. The special attention from a special teacher	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
D. The personality of the Corrective Reading teacher	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
E. The skills of the Corrective Reading teacher	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
F. The diagnostic procedures used	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
G. Other (specify)					
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS / Teachers - Principals

5. A. How often have you met with the Corrective Reading teacher in your school?

( ) At least once a week ( ) Once a fortnight ( ) Once a month ( ) Once or twice ( ) Not at all

B. If you have met with Corrective Reading teachers, what did you discuss mainly? (Check one or more).

( ) Common problems ( ) Pupils
( ) The program in general ( ) Other (specify)_____

C. Please indicate below your opinion of the Corrective Reading teachers assigned to your school in respect to the three characteristics indicated.

	Teacher 1		Teacher 2
I. Check one for each teacher	( )	Capable	( )
	( )	Fairly capable	( )
	( )	Not capable	( )
II. Check one for each teacher	( )	Cooperative	( )
	( )	Fairly cooperative	( )
	( )	Not at all cooperative	( )
III. Check one for each teacher	( )	Well trained	( )
	( )	Fairly well trained	( )
	( )	Untrained	( )

6. How would you assess the reaction of the individuals listed below to the Corrective Reading Program?

	Very Favorable	Somewhat Favorable	Neutral	Very Unfavorable	Somewhat Unfavorable
A. The children in the program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
B. Parents of the children in the program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
C. Children not in the program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
D. Parents of children not in the program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
E. The principal	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
F. Other teachers in the school	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS / Teachers - Principals

7. Will you please assess the aspects of the Corrective Reading Program listed below?

	Excellent	Adequate	In need of Improvement	No Judgement
A. Procedures for selecting children	( )	( )	( )	( )
B. Scheduling	( )	( )	( )	( )
C. Your communication with Corrective Reading teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )
D. Liaison of program with school	( )	( )	( )	( )
E. Provision for locating the program	( )	( )	( )	( )
F. Other				
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )

Your comments and suggestions on <u>all</u> aspects of the program are most welcome. (Use back of page if you wish).

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

CR-NPS, FORM #10
School_____ Code _____
Address_____ District____
CRT_____ Date: June __, 1967

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs
ESEA, Title I, Nonpublic Schools
141 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Total No. Serviced _____
Total No. Now in Program _____
Range of ITT Level from ____ to ____
Median ITT Level _____

Range of Progress _____ mos. __ to __
Median Progress _____ months _____
Range of Hrs. of Instr. ___ From ___
to ___
Median Hours of Instr. _____

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT, 1966 - 67

COMPLETED REPORTS ARE DUE ON JUNE 12, 1967

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAMES OF PUPILS (List Alphabetically, Identify boys and girls)	C.A. 5.17.67	GRADE IN SCHOOL	DATE AD. TO PROG.	ITT LEVEL Init.	ITT LEVEL Final	PROG. IN MONTHS	HRS. OF INSTR.	SESS. ABS.	R. TEST SCORE Init.	R. TEST SCORE Final	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN: Work Habits, Attitude Toward Reading, etc.
1.											
2.											
3.											
4.											
5.											
6.											
7.											
8.											
9.											
10.											

Col:
1. Include all pupils on program since Sept. 1966. (If pupil was dropped during the school year, write dropped, date and reason for dismissal in col. 12)
2. Compute the child's chronological age (C.A.) as 5/17/67 or up to date of dismissal.
3. Indicate child's school grade.
4. Indicate date when pupil was admitted to the Corrective Reading Program.
5. Indicate ITT level when pupil entered the program.
6. Indicate ITT level 5/67, or level of child when he was dismissed.
7. Indicate progress achieved up to date in months; e.g., if a child progressed from a 2-1 level to a 3-2 level, his progress is 15 months. (There are 10 mos. in a school year)
8. Indicate no. of sessions attended up to present
9. Indicate no. of sessions missed by the pupil for whatever reason.
10. If you administered a Metropolitan achievement test in Sept., 1966, indicate the grade score achieved. If this data is not available, leave col. 10 blank.
11. Enter the grade score achieved in the final testing, May 1967.
12. Briefly enter any comments or remarks regarding significant changes.

More space was used on original data collection.

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. Aaron S. Carton
Office of Research and Evaluation
Division of Teacher Education
The City University of New York

Mrs. Sema Brainin
Educational Researcher and Program Planner
Evaluational Research of Summer Head Start

Mrs. Barbara Levy
Research Assistant
Center for Urban Education

Mrs. Rosalind S. Ritter
Research Assistant
Center for Urban Education